



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/028,542

12/19/2001

Reynaldo Gil

21-013 ITW 20550

2451

68495

7590

07/28/2008

PERRY HOFFMAN AND ASSOCIATES, P.C.

P.O. BOX 1649

DEERFIELD, IL 60015

EXAMINER

JEANTY, ROMAIN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3623

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/28/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/028,542	Applicant(s) GIL ET AL.	
	Examiner ROMAIN JEANTY	Art Unit 3623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 April 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11-13, 15-31, 38-42 and 44-59 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11-13, 15-31, 38-42 and 44-59 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 4/16/2008 has been entered. Claims 1-9, 11-13, 15-31, 38-42 and 44-59 are pending in the application.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-59 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. Claims 1-9, 11-13, 15-31 and 38-42, 44-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 based on Supreme Court precedent, and recent Federal Circuit decisions, the Office's guidance to examiners is that a § 101 process must (1) be tied to another statutory class (such as a particular apparatus) or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or

Art Unit: 3623

materials) to a different state or thing. *Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); *Parker v. Flook*, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972); *Cochrane v. Deener*, 94 U.S. 780, 787-88 (1876).

An example of a method claim that would not qualify as a statutory process would be a claim that recited purely mental steps. Thus, to qualify as a § 101 statutory process, the claim should positively recite the other statutory class (the thing or product) to which it is tied, for example by identifying the apparatus that accomplishes the method steps, or positively recite the subject matter that is being transformed, for example by identifying the material that is being changed to a different state.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1-5, 7-9, 11-13, 17-20, 22, 24-29, 51, 53-54 and 55-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Stewart et al (US 2002/0010741).

Regarding claims 1, 51, 53-54 and 56-57, discloses Stewart et al discloses a workflow integration system for enterprise wide electronic collaboration. In so doing, Stewart discloses receiving a request for the transaction from an end-user or the partner [Paragraph 0029], accessing real-time data relevant to the transaction from an existing

Art Unit: 3623

partner system [Paragraph 0056], generating a context for the transaction using the real-time data [Paragraph 0145], processing the request in the context for the transaction [Paragraphs 0027 and 0028], initiating a workflow for the transaction at a network system responsive to processing the request and further initiating at least one process manager routine for managing the workflow with the end-user or the partner of said receiving step and the existing partner system actively participating in sending or receiving one or more messages relating in the transaction [Paragraph 0029, 0030, 0065 and 0083];

Regarding claim 2, Stewart et al further discloses the method of claim 1, wherein said accessing comprises communicating with a partner coordinator component integrated with the existing partner system [Paragraph 0088].

Regarding claim 3, Stewart et al further disclose the method of claim 1, wherein the real-time data comprises transaction data specifying a status for the transaction [Paragraph 0151].

Regarding claim 4, Stewart et al further disclose the method of claim 1, wherein the real-time data comprises reference data relating to the partner [Paragraphs 0259 and 0171].

Regarding claim 5, Stewart et al further disclose the method of claim 1, wherein accessing comprises receiving the real-time data in extensible markup language (XML) format [Paragraph 0088].

Regarding claim 7, Stewart et al discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising maintaining a context for the transaction at a network system [Paragraph 0056].

Regarding claim 8, Stewart et al further discloses the method of claim 7, further

Art Unit: 3623

comprising: identifying the context for the transaction based upon the request; and routing the request for processing of the transaction [Paragraph 0151].

Regarding claim 9, Stewart et al further discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising sending a response to the request to the end-user or the partner [Paragraph 0323].

Regarding claim 11, Stewart et al further discloses the method of claim 10, wherein the workflow comprises a plurality of tasks to be performed by the enterprise or partner in order to fulfill the transaction [Paragraph 0085].

Regarding claim 12, Stewart et al further discloses the method of claim 11, wherein processing comprises notifying the partner of any tasks to be performed by the partner [Paragraph 0088].

Regarding claim 13, Stewart et al the method of claim 10, wherein processing comprises initiating at least one process manager routine for managing the workflow [See abstract].

Claim 17-20, 22, 24-29 and 58 are system for managing a transaction involving an enterprise and at least one partner in a supply chain, which recites similar limitations of method claims 1-5, 9, 11-13 above; therefore claims 17-20, 22, 24-29 and 58 are rejected under the same analysis relied upon of claims 1-5, 9, 11-13, .

Regarding claim 55, Stewart further discloses wherein each workflow comprises a process for transforming the real-time data according to a business policy between the enterprise and the partner [Paragraph 0280].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 6, 23, 41-42, 44-50 and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart et al (US 2002/0010741).

Regarding claims 6 and 23, Stewart et al fails to disclose converting/transforming the real-time data into a format usable by a network system, the network system operable to maintain the context for the transaction. Data conversion is old and well known in the art in order to render the data more versatile. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosures of Stewart to include converting the real-time data into a format usable by a network system with the motivation to make the data more versatile.

Regarding claims 41-42, 44-50, Stewart discloses a network execution component operable to administer a transaction involving an enterprise and at least one partner in the supply chain [Paragraph 0341], and a network domain gateway in communication with the network execution component, communicate with a partner coordinator component integrated with an existing system of the partner to provide real-time data relevant to the transaction from the existing system of the partner to the network execution component [Paragraphs 0065 and 0083], a transport component operable to send or receive one or more messages related to the transaction with the real-time data facilitating active processing between the enterprise and the at least one partner in the supply chain for

Art Unit: 3623

actively participating in at least one actual transaction [Paragraphs 0066-0067 and 0256] Stewart discloses the concept of a C-gateway [See Figure 23 and Paragraph 0281], but Stewart fails to explicitly disclose a network domain gateway. Official Notice is taken that utilizing a network domain gateway to route information to a user's IP address is old and well known in the communication art. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the disclosures of Stewart to incorporate a network domain gateway in order to route real-time data efficiently.

Regarding claim 50, Stewart et al further disclose the network system of claim 48, wherein the database is operable to store one or more policy rules that govern the transaction [Paragraph 0174].

9. Claims 15-16, 21, 30-31 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart et al (US 2002/0010741) in view of Grosvenor (U.S. Patent No. 7,216,086).

Regarding claims 15-16, 21, 30-31 and 52, Stewart et al discloses the method of claim 1 above, but Stewart et al fails to disclose wherein processing comprises alerting the partner or the enterprise. Grosvenor in the same field of endeavor discloses a supply chain management system which alerts partners, moa service level associated with the transaction (col. 2, lines 51-67 and col. 12, lines 21-37). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the disclosures of Stewart et al to include the teachings of Grosvenor in order to resolve one or more discrepancies in an outsourced manufacturing supply chain in which a plurality of supply chain partners participate.

Art Unit: 3623

10. Claims 38 and 39-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart et al (US 2002/0010741) in view of Burr et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,510,216).

Regarding claims 38 and 40, Stewart et al discloses a database operable to store real-time data relating to the transaction {Paragraph 0071}, at least one process workflow executing on a processing facility, the process workflow operable to process workflow access to the real-time data relating to the transaction, thereby providing a context for the transaction during processing [Paragraph 0029, 0030, 0065 and 0083]. Stewart et al fails to explicitly disclose a data access layer. Burr et al in the same field of endeavor discloses the concept of using a data access layer (col. 3, lines 9-35). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the disclosures of Stewart et al to include a data access layer as taught by Burr in order to make the system more flexible, easy to maintain and operable.

Regarding claim 39, Stewart further discloses wherein the workflow comprises a plurality of tasks to be performed by the enterprise or partner in order to fulfill the transaction [Paragraph 0085].

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

K. Xu et al (Towards better coordination of the supply chain), discloses a supply chain management system.

Art Unit: 3623

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Romain Jeanty whose telephone number is (571)272-6732. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs 7:30 am to 6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Beth Van Doren can be reached on (571) 272-6737. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Romain Jeanty/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3623
July 7, 2003